

VZCZCXYZ0001
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #1152/01 1661201
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 151201Z JUN 07
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 9507
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 001152

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCB, L/ACV, IO/S
SECDEF FOR OSD/ISP
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (GOLDMAN)
NSC FOR LEDDY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC): WRAP-UP FOR THE
WEEK ENDING JUNE 8

This is CWC-54-07.

OCPF SITE SELECTION

11. (U) In the June 5 WEOG meeting, the facilitator for consultations on this issue (Luis Garcia, Spain) announced that, in light of the May 25 Note by the DG on the Technical Secretariat's initiative in this area, he had asked the

SIPDIS
Vice-Chair for the Industry Cluster to cancel the June 13 consultation and begin the process of finding a new facilitator. Many WEOG delegations asked him to reconsider. The U.S. Del, along with Canada, emphasized the importance that any oral report by Garcia to the EC or EC report language stress the EC's desire to return to consider the matter of "proposals by States Parties" (VA Part IX, para 11(c)) at some future point.

WEOG REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION ON EPOD

12. (U) Also in the June 5 WEOG meeting, the chair (Christer Ahlstrom, Sweden) reported his discussion with the TS on end-point of destruction (EPOD), based on requests from France in earlier meetings. The TS was unwilling to prepare a written summary on EPOD without a written request from the WEOG. Generally, the idea of preparing a written WEOG request received very little support from delegations (especially Canada, the Netherlands and Ireland) given the dangers surrounding such an action and the uniqueness of each facility agreement. Annie Mari of France said she was under strict orders from Paris to get more details on how this has been addressed at each of the destruction facilities, and said France would have to address this informally with the TS.

ARTICLE VI INSPECTION LEVELS

¶3. (SBU) Following the June 5 WEOG meeting, Mari asked del reps about inspection levels within the U.S. so far in 2007. Apparently, France has yet to host an inspection in 2007. This raised concerns in Paris about whether inspections were being held at an appropriate level worldwide. They are also concerned that, if the TS intends to carry out its typical annual inspection level in France during 2007, the second half of the year will be extremely busy. Del rep shared with Mari what was heard from an inspection team leader -- that the TS was very busy early in the year carrying out initial inspections at a number of newly-declared facilities, many of which were in the Middle East.

¶4. (SBU) This led del rep to a similar discussion with the Japanese later in the same day. The Japanese delegate (Kiwako Tanaka) reported that Japan has hosted two inspections to date -- one Schedule 3, one OCPF.

SCHEDULE 2 FACILITY AGREEMENT

¶5. (U) Del presented the TS with the National Authority letter confirming that the USG has no additional changes to the Schedule 2 facility agreement. Negotiations on this document were concluded in the fall of 2006. After some preliminary grumbling from PMO director Khodakov about this "late addition to the EC agenda," he agreed to include it, and preparations are underway. The TS provided del rep draft decision language for this action, which follows the pattern of other such facility agreements.

ARTICLE VII OUTREACH AND THE EU

¶6. (U) Del rep met June 7 with Ronald Munch (Germany) to discuss the EU Joint Action and corresponding outreach efforts on universality and Article VII. Munch began by explaining the various aspects of the EU Joint Action in these areas. He acknowledged the difference between the EU technique and that of the U.S.: the U.S. has been more willing to approach States Parties (SP) directly to offer assistance, whereas the EU has relied on the expertise of the TS in targeting this assistance.

SIPDIS

¶7. (U) Munch said that they continue to feel that bilateral assistance visits in capitals are the most effective. Munch said that requests the TS receives that would take advantage of EU funding would first be screened by the TS and then discussed with the EU presidency (currently Germany). To ensure timeliness, he reported that the process would not be so formal when the request was for experts from the EU to accompany the TS during a visit. Given the relative newness of the EU Joint Action, no such reviews have been held so far, although he expected this to happen for the first time in July. Given that Portugal takes over the EU presidency in July, and in response to a question from del rep, Munch said that this process would continue as he outlined. He did not expect Portugal's less-than-complete status under Article VII to impact their ability to carry out this role effectively.

¶8. (U) Munch did note that Portugal will not complete its Article VII parliamentary work before it takes over the EU presidency in July. Although this is of no concern to Germany as far as nonproliferation, etc., they still fear that this "looks bad." He encouraged the U.S. to continue putting pressure on Portugal, as well as Belgium, to complete their parliamentary work.

¶9. (U) Given that many of the "20-in-10" SPs have their legislation sitting in parliament, this topic was discussed at length. Munch pointed to the section of the EU Joint Action that provided resources to parliamentary outreach. Although he thought the TS and the DG specifically were doing

more in the area of parliamentary outreach, he was concerned that the DG might be focusing mainly on those that were reaching out to him, which seems to mean more attention in the GRULAC. Del rep proposed, and Munch agreed, that perhaps we both could approach the DG quietly to encourage more direct outreach by the DG to parliamentarians in the "20-in-10" SPs.

¶10. (U) Del rep reviewed in general the bilateral activities the U.S. is undertaking, especially in conjunction with other events (e.g., SPP, EXBS, CTR), as well as the known efforts of other SPs. Munch said that, even though the EU efforts were more reactive, they would be willing to be more aggressive in working directly with a SP or asking the TS to do so, if the U.S. felt there was an especially significant need. Del rep committed to discuss this with him further, outlining exactly what might be done with many of the "20-in-10" SPs.

¶11. (U) On universality, Munch reported that their efforts in encouraging Angola to participate in the upcoming CWC workshop in Algiers might be bearing fruit. The latest information from Angola is that the foreign minister may attend.

ARTICLE X

¶12. (U) Article X consultations were conducted by facilitator Jitka Brodska (Czech Republic) on June 6. Discussion centered on the Status of Implementation Report on Article X. During EC-48 the U.S. persuaded the UK to defer action on the report (EC-48/DG.13) until consultations could be held to discuss the report. The resulting discussion was wide-ranging and thorough, touching on nearly every aspect of the Article X. Gennadi Lutay, Head of the Assistance and Protection Branch (APB), said the report had been delayed by its size and it required cooperation of other branches.

¶13. (U) Lutay noted there are many requests for courses and to satisfy these requests, APB is endeavoring to achieve standardization of courses, utilizing TS staff and contracting with experts. Brodska asked when the TS was planning another assistance and protection exercise, suggesting they find synergy with another entity similar to the Ukraine exercise (held in conjunction with NATO). Lutay did not acknowledge the synergy comment, focusing instead on limitations, saying exercises can only be done every 3 years, and that a member state needs to offer a venue. He used this opportunity to appeal for a volunteer to host the exercise.

¶14. (U) France reiterated the facilitators theme by asking if the TS could see if the OPCW could join an existing exercise and what the costs were for the 2005 exercise. Lutay only commented that he did not know the cost of the Ukraine exercise. The Netherlands asked about the APB training courses: are lessons-learned utilized, are they developing computerized learning tools, training trainers. The Dutch also wanted to know the ratio of time and money going to one SP versus regional training courses. Lutay said efficiency is a big issue, noting even one or two courses are not enough to prepare first responders. They have tried to use a "train the trainers" approach, but it is only mildly successful.

¶15. (U) The TS is working on electronic media, but feel personalized practical training is more effective. The new Director of International Cooperation and Assistance, Kalimi Mworio, said they need to encourage SPs to send the right people to courses; people who can invigorate others. She noted that some SPs send policy people over first responders, and that is when errors can happen when taking the training back home. Mworio further noted the TS cannot dictate who can come to their courses. South Africa asked if there is a framework in which APB activities can build onto each other. Lutay said they do so when they can, but it is not generally practical.

¶16. (U) One topic that came up in this discussion with Lutay and Mworio was creation of a regional capability. Training should be focused on a regional entity with the capability to help others. And make certain they have all the necessary equipment available close at hand. In that case, if the need arises for assistance, it can come from highly trained people who are in the same geographic region and can get there sooner than from Europe or elsewhere. This was not further discussed, but del rep believes this could be the direction the TS moves in coming sessions.

¶17. (U) In response to a Chinese query on putting the databank on the external server, Lutay said there continue to be technical/computer issues between the databank and the external server, but they are working on it. Del rep requested earlier submission of the report so delegations could review and discuss it prior to approving it in the EC. The facilitator said she would make a point to put these consultations on next year's schedule.

¶18. (U) On agenda item 2, National Protective Program (NPP) submission (Article X, para 4), the facilitator noted the low rate of submissions and gave three suggestions to raise submission rates.

-- First, use all APB activities to promote submission.

-- Second, the facilitator noted regional patterns and suggested working that angle.

-- Third, the facilitator noted the synergy between Article X and Article VII. Brodska said there were 34 Technical Assistance Visits scheduled for 2007 and of those 25 have not submitted the NPP. She suggested asking the TAVs to work on this during their workshops.

¶19. (U) Italy asked what the TS has done to promote submissions -- how are they using the format delegations worked so hard to pass in 2004. Lutay answered by reciting their usual practices (mailings, workshops). Del rep suggested e-mailing the form to NAs where possible and echoed the facilitators suggestion of having the TAVs provide

information on NPP submissions.

¶20. (U) On agenda Item 3, APB Activities, the TS again went over its programs for 2007. There was no real discussion on this topic, but it led into a discussion of Article X, para 7 offers of assistance. The TS said the recent letter asking for delegations to renew offers is intended to ensure offers of equipment and materials offered are still in working order. The TS said it plans to follow up with countries who made unilateral offers to see if they could change those into bilateral agreements.

¶21. (U) On agenda Item 4, Any Other Business, the UK referred to the TS promise to send out letters in January requesting updates to the protection network experts list. The TS said they sent out e-mails and had not received much response. They further noted they will be hosting a Protection Network Meeting in November and hope to be able to have an updated list prior to that meeting. The Netherlands noted that they had not received an email and have a number of experts to change. The facilitator said this is obviously an important topic and will be discussed in the next meeting. Tunisia said that at a recent APB workshop in their country, there was a problem with an inadequate number of translators, and requested voluntary contributions toward this expense. Lutay noted they provide translators whenever possible, however some training is too complicated to be done with translation.

¶22. (U) The facilitator said consultations would begin again in September/October. Further, she did not think report language was necessary for the EC, and no delegation disagreed.

¶23. (U) Comment: Del rep has gone to a number of different consultations on a variety of issues over the past three years. Some are sparsely attended, but nearly all Article X consultations have a wide and diverse attendance, indicating

that a broad spectrum of SPs place great importance on Article X. Unquestionably, much more could be accomplished in Article X meetings, but the sizable attendance is a positive sign, as is the fact that there are generally fewer efforts by normally obstreperous delegations to block work.

¶24. (U) Ito sends.

ARNALL